



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/576,117

04/18/2006

Ulrich Bohne

3628

4805

7590  
Striker, Striker & Stenby  
103 East Neck Road  
Huntington, NY 11743

01/12/2011

EXAMINER

DEXTER, CLARK F

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3724

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/12/2011

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**ATTACHMENT TO ADVISORY ACTION (paper no. 5)**

Applicant's arguments filed December 22, 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In the first paragraph on page 10 of the subject response, applicant argues:

“Contrary to the applicant's invention, while the lateral boundary lines at the ends of each of the working edges are straight lines, they are not radial straight lines or in other words they do not extend from the working edge exactly in the radial direction or along a radius which intersects with the center.”

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant's analysis. As viewed in Figure 3 (which is the cover page figure) of Paulus, it is respectfully submitted that Paulus teaches edges 27, 28 which are clearly radially extending straight edges; that is, Paulus teaches straight edges that are coaxial with a radius that extends from the center of hub 22 of the cutting tool 18.

Regarding applicant's arguments directed to the other teaching reference examples of Johnson and Wurst, these references clearly teach straight edges that extend in a radial direction, for example, broadly interpreted as compared to a circumferential direction. However, the Examiner acknowledges that neither of these particular examples teaches the straight edge extending exactly along a radius which intersects the center of the cutting tool. However, it is respectfully submitted that no such limitation has been claimed. All that is required is that the edges are straight and extend in a radial direction. It is respectfully submitted that Johnson and Wurst broadly teach such a structure.

Therefore, for at least the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the prior art rejections must be maintained.

cfd  
January 11, 2011